PEER REVIEW PLAN
FOR
GENERAL RE-EVALUATION STUDY
TAMPA HARBOR PROJECT, FLORIDA
OCTOBER 2007

For questions or comments regarding this Peer Review Plan, please forward your comments to:

Title	Telephone	Email
Project Manager	904-232- 3915	Click here to email Project Manager

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS PEER REVIEW PLAN IS DISTRIBUTED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PREDISSEMINATION PEER REVIEW UNDER APPLICABLE INFORMATION QUALITY GUIDELINES. IT HAS NOT BEEN FORMALLY DISSEMINATED BY THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, JACKSONVILLE DISTRICT. IT DOES NOT REPRESENT AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO REPRESENT ANY AGENCY DETERMINATION OR POLICY.

PEER REVIEW PLAN
for
GENERAL RE-EVALUATION STUDY
TAMPA HARBOR PROJECT, FLORIDA
OCTOBER 2007

1. PURPOSE

This Peer Review Plan (PRP) provides a technical peer review mechanism ensuring quality products are developed during the course of the study by the Jacksonville District (SAJ). All processes, quality control, quality assurance, and policy review will be done to complement each other producing a review process that identifies and resolves technical and policy issues during the course of the study and not during the final study stages.

The PRP is intended to describe the processes that will be implemented to independently (of the Project Team) evaluate the technical sufficiency of the planning study. The PRP is a collaborative product of the Project Delivery Team (PDT) and the National Deep Draft Navigation Planning Center of Expertise (DDNPCX). The DDNPCX shall manage the peer review processes, which for this study includes an Independent Technical Review (ITR) and an External Peer Review (EPR).

ITR is a critical examination by a qualified person or team, predominantly within the Corps of Engineers (Corps), which was not involved in the day-to-day technical work that supports a decision document. ITR is intended to confirm that such work was done in accordance with clearly established professional principles, practices, codes and criteria informed by Engineering Regulation (ER) 1105-2-100.

EPR is in addition to ITR, and is added to the Corps existing review process in special cases where the risk and magnitude of the proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified person or team outside of the Corps and not involved in the day-to-day production of a technical product is necessary. EPR will similarly be added in cases where information is based on novel methods, presents complex challenges for interpretation, contains precedent-setting methods or modes, presents conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices, or is likely to affect policy decisions that have a significant impact. In the absence of the above-described criteria, high project cost may, by itself, necessitate EPR.

2. REFERENCES

ER 1105-2-100, “Planning Guidance Notebook
EC 1105-2-408, “Peer Review of Decision Documents”, dated May 31, 2005
CECW-CP Memorandum, “Peer Review Process”, dated March 30, 2007
Water Resources Council's Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies, Chapter II - (National Economic Development NED) Benefit Evaluation Procedures (March 10, 1983).

3. PROJECT/STUDY BACKGROUND

Tampa Harbor Federal Navigation Project is located on the west coast of Florida within the boundaries of Tampa Bay and south of the city of Tampa, Florida (Attachment 1 – Tampa Harbor Location Map, attached). The non-Federal sponsor is the Tampa Port Authority, hereafter referred to as "TPA".

Federal Authority

House Document 91-401, 91st Congress, December 31, 1970, authorized the initiation and partial accomplishment of the Tampa Harbor project not to exceed $40,000,000.

The House of Representatives Congressional Resolution 2533, 105th Congress (1997) adopted a resolution requesting:

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Tampa Harbor, Florida, published as House Document 491, 91st Congress, Second Session and other pertinent reports, with a view of determining if the authorized project should be modified in any way at this time, with particular reference to a deep draft anchorage." The basis for the re-evaluation is the 1969 Survey-Review Report on Tampa Harbor, Florida. The project resulting from that report is described in House Document No. 91-401 and was authorized in Public Law 91-611, Title I, Section 101. A harbor-wide initiative rescaled and focused efforts to evaluate congestion relief proposals in the main ship channel and the need for anchorage areas.

Congressional interest in the Tampa Bay navigational improvements was confirmed on November 7, 2003 by the 108th Congress in Report No. 108-357, Energy and Water Act which contained the following language:

> *That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use funds appropriated for the navigation project, Tampa Harbor, Florida, to carry out, as part of the project, construction of passing lanes in an area approximately 3.5 miles long, centered on Tampa Bay Cut B, if the Secretary determines that such construction is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and cost effective.*

Proposed Project Modifications: The Tampa Harbor GRR has been funded to investigate improvements to the Tampa Harbor Project. Improving navigation and National security are the primary missions of the general re-evaluation study. The final alternatives will be reviewed for consistency with TPA's master plan. Proposed modifications that will be examined include (but are not limited to) the following:

1. Creation of anchorage areas within Tampa Bay for safe passing of vessels

2. Other congestion-relieving modifications to include:
    a. construction of passing lanes
    b. creation of a loop channel
    c. creation of turning basins at channel intersections
3. East Bay channel modifications (for container traffic and relocation of ship repair facilities) to include:
    a. East Bay channel widening or deepening
    b. East Bay channel extension
4. Main channel deepening/widening (based in part on double-hull vessels that are wider than the current fleet)
5. Big Bend deepening due to containers
6. Extension of the Federal Port Sutton Terminal Channel
7. Construction of previously authorized projects
8. Non-structural components

In addition, the following will be included either as project components or as part of the Tampa Harbor Project Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP to be revised in keeping with the results of the study):

a. Mitigation strategies. The GRR will include a description of the Federal monitoring ability. An environmental monitoring program will be presented in the GRR for the recommended plan (including costs). Monitoring will be incorporated as an operations and maintenance (O&M) cost as necessary. Tampa Bay Estuary Program's EPA-funded grant for dredged hole assessment may provide background information for the monitoring program.
b. Project footprint. The GRR will cover all work to be done for any Federal project improvements, including berthing area and access channel dredging conducted concurrently with dredging for the Federal project as necessary. A harborwide water quality certificate will be an outcome of the study, if appropriate.
c. Placement areas. The GRR will discuss potential use of the permitted offshore dredge material disposal site (ODMDS), as well as address other placement options which may be least cost alternatives.
d. Beneficial uses of dredged material. This topic is addressed extensively in the Tampa Bay Dredged Material Management Strategy and in the DMMP. Information gathered that supplements that already addressed will be included in the GRR.

In addition, the Tampa Agency on Bay Management has identified the following concerns that must be considered as appropriate within the scope of the resource survey and impact analysis:

a. Determine direct and indirect impacts to Manatees
b. Report on potential seagrass and hard-bottom habitat loss and impacts to larval fishes and shellfish due to changes in Bay circulation and flushing patterns
c. Report on how the proposed improvements will affect State-designated Aquatic Preserves or other Outstanding Florida Waters.

Based on preliminary benefits and costs (in the AFB Package), alternative D4, Channel Widening (Main Cut A and B) represents the NED plan. Alternative D4 maximizes NED benefits with total net benefits of $823,503. Alternative D4 has preliminary total costs of $30,286,000.

The Project Delivery Team

Project Manager	Civil Engineer	Jacksonville District
Planning Technical Lead	Civil Engineer	Jacksonville District
Engineering Technical Lead	Civil Engineer	Jacksonville District
Geotechnical Analysis	Geologist	Jacksonville District
Cost Engineering	Cost Engineer	Jacksonville District
Hydrodynamic Modeling	Hydraulic Engineer	Jacksonville District
Environmental Analysis	Biologist	Jacksonville District
Real Estate Evaluation	Real Estate Specialist	Jacksonville District
Economic Analysis	Economist	Jacksonville District
Construction/Operations	Civil Engineer	Jacksonville District
Legal Evaluation	Attorney	Jacksonville District

4. INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW PLAN

ITR is performed at key points in the study process to ensure the proper application of appropriate regulations and professional procedures. Skilled and experienced personnel who have not been associated with the development of the study products perform the ITR. ITR team members may be employees of U.S. Army Corps of Engineer Districts, other Federal agencies, state or local government agencies, universities, private contractors or other institutions. The key factor is extensive, expert knowledge in their field of expertise. DrChecks document review and comment software will be used to document the ITRs.

The relevant National Planning Center of Expertise, in this case for Deep Draft Navigation (DDNPCX), has ultimate responsibility for accomplishing ITR. The DDNPCX is requested to form an ITR Team, and to conduct ITR of the Draft and Final Reports.

Also, a Cost Estimating Directory of Expertise (Cost Dx) has been established, at the Corps Walla Walla District (NWW). The completed draft report cost estimate may require review by the Cost Dx. The DDNPCX is requested, herein, to coordinate cost estimation review with the Cost Dx. The working assumption is that the DDNPCX would secure Cost Dx approval of the proposed cost estimating reviewer, and that the Draft Report review would apply the proper Cost Dx-provided checklist. The completed checklist would be returned to the Cost Dx for approval.

Technical disciplines determined to be appropriate for review of the draft and final reports, at a minimum, include: plan formulation, economics, environmental/NEPA compliance, hydraulics and hydrology, geotechnical engineering, cost engineering, and real estate. SAJ and the DDNPCX will collaborate to produce detailed scopes of work

prior to each review. All should be well-versed in conduct of deep draft navigation studies that potentially include both the deepening and widening of channels and all associated activities. Suggested issues to inform the review include:

a. Plan formulation – adequacy and comprehensiveness

b. Economic evaluation – DDNPCX certification of planning model (HarborSym)and evaluation of analytical methods employed in the economic evaluation

Harbor Sym, one of the Institute for Water Resources (IWR) planning models, is presently undergoing a revision to incorporate Deepening to the already available widening capability. At the completion of that effort IWR will take the lead to get the model through the certification process.

c. Environmental Analysis, General – whether or not all pertinent issues were adequately addressed

d. NEPA Compliance – whether or not all NEPA requirements were, or will be met.

e. Geotechnical engineering – whether or not analyses and conclusions are reasonable

f. Hydraulic engineering evaluations – whether or not analyses and conclusions are reasonable

g. Cost engineering

h. Real Estate issues

The DDNPCX will be responsible for organizing and employing a qualified team. A detailed scope of work and cost estimate will be agreed to between the project District and the DDNPCX prior to each review.

5. EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW PLAN

In order to determine if external peer review is warranted for this particular project, an evaluation was conducted of the risk and magnitude of the proposed project, including consideration of whether or not study conclusions were based on novel methods, present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or modes, present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices, or are likely to affect policy decisions that have a significant impact, as called for in EC 1105-2-408, Section 4.b.

External Peer Review Requirement Determination

For this study, it has been determined that EPR is not required. None of the criteria considered to trigger the need for EPR were met. Evaluations of individual decision criteria are provided below.

Unusually high risk or magnitude indicated?

The proposed project does not appear to include risks that are greater than normally would be expected for a deep draft navigation project. As well, total project cost is not expected to exceed the proposed trigger of $40M.

Study conclusions based upon novel methods?

Hydraulic and economic evaluations employ methods typical of a deep draft navigation project, and would not appear to warrant external peer review on this basis.

Study conclusions present complex challenges for interpretation?

Interpretation challenges, for this project, are typical of that for a deep draft navigation project and are not expected to present complex challenges for interpretation.

Study conclusions contain precedent-setting methods or modes?

Well established analytical methods and modes were employed and are not considered precedent-setting.

Study conclusions likely to change prevailing practices?

Study conclusions are expected to be typical of a deep draft navigation project and are not expected to change prevailing practices.

6. ADDITIONAL REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS

Public and Agency Comment and Dissemination

Public involvement is anticipated throughout the preparation of the Decision Document. Public information meetings are conducted to inform the general public, other federal and state agencies and interested stakeholders of the status of the project and alternatives being considered. At a minimum, public meetings have/will be conducted as part of the National Environment Policy Act (NEPA) compliance process, including: Public scoping meetings and the public review period of the Draft Environmental Assessment.

7. CONSOLIDATED SCHEDULE

- ITR of FSM Package (completed)
- ITR of AFB Package (completed September 2007)
- ITR of economic modeling deliverables (continuous through October 2007)

- District Review of Draft Report, November 2007
- ITR of Draft Report, December 2007
- Public and Agency review of Draft Report, January 2008
- Final Report (Not required (Certification provided at review of Draft when report supported by an EA, rather than an EIS)

8. POINTS OF CONTACT

Due to confidentiality law requirements with posting documents on websites for public review, only the Project Manager is listed as the point of contact for any questions concerning this Peer Review Plan and qualifications of members of the PDT team:

Title	Telephone	Email
Project Manager	904-232-3915	Click here to email the Project Manager

Attachment 1 –Tampa Harbor Location Map